DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 624 UD 024 200

AUTHOR Clark, M. L.; Ayers, Marla
TITLE Race, Gender and Reciprocity Effects on Friendship Similarity during Early Adolescence.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 1985); For related document, see UD 024 187.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Black Students; *Friendship; Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Relationship; Junior High Schools; *Proximity; *Racial Differences; *Sex Differences; Sociometric Techniques; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *Reciprocity; *Similarity Ratings

ABSTRACT

One hundred and thirty-six 7th and 8th graders were studied in order to investigate the effects of race, gender, and reciprocity on friendship similarity and proximity in early adolescence. Six measures were administered to participants to obtain data on their friendship choices, friendship proximity, degree of friendship satisfaction and commitment, interpersonal attitudes, verbal intelligence, personality, physical attractiveness, sex, and race. On the basis of these data, subjects were categorized into dyads based on three variables: reciprocity or mutuality, sex, and race. Further analysis yielded the following major findings: Female friends were more similar than male friends and Black friends were more similar than White friends, regardless of reciprocity. The reciprocal dyads consisted of more same-sex, same-race, and female friends. Cross-race friendships occurred less frequently than same-race friendships and more frequently than cross-sex friendships, and appeared to be closer in structure to White than Black friendships. And finally, cross-race friends appeared to have less contact with each other than same-race friends, and White friends had more in-school contact than Black friends. It is concluded that similarity and proximity are more important than reciprocity in understanding the nature of early adolescent friendships and that the nature of friendships differs as a function of race and gender. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document *
****

ED255624

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.L. Clark ; Marla Ayers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Race, Gender and Reciprocity Effects on Friendship Similarity During Early Adolescence

M. L. Clark and Marla Ayers

Wake Forest University

Running Head: FRIENDSHIP SIMILARITY

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1985

CS024200

BEST COPY

Abstract

The relationship of reciprocity, dyad sex and dyad race to similarity and proximity in adolescent friendships was studied. Intelligence, interpersonal attitudes, personality, physical attractiveness, proximity and nonschool interaction were measured for 136 junior high school students. Dyads were classified based on mutuality, gender, and racial composition. Female dyads were more similar than male dyads on intelligence and 6 personality variables. Black dyads were more similar than white dyads in physical attractiveness and 4 personality variables. The reciprocal dyads consisted of more same-sex, same-race and female friends. The nature of friendships differed as a function of race and gender.

BEST COPY

Race, Gender and Reciprocity effects on

Friendship Similarity during Early Adolescence

Interpersonal attraction theorists have identified similarity, reciprocity-of-liking and proximity as the basic determinants of friendship formation and maintenance (see Berscheid & Walster, 1983; Duck & Craig, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Early adolescents have been found to be similar to their friends in school attitudes, interests, educational aspirations, actual achievements, and orientations toward teen culture (Ball, 1981; Cohen, 1977; Epstein, 1983; Kandel, 1978; Karweit & Hansell, 1983). Children of all ages tend to select for friends those who are similar in race and especially gender (Asher, Oden, & Gottman, 1977; Clark & Drewry, in press; Schofield, 1981; Tuma & Hallinan, 1979).

Numerous studies have investigated similarity in the personalities of friends for college students (Izard, 1960; Duck & Craig, 1978) and adult populations (Duck & Spencer, 1972). Generally they have found that close friends do tend to have more similar personalities than non-friends, however, some results have been contrary to the similarity-attraction hypothesis (Henderson & Furnham, 1982). In addition, most of the physical attractiveness research investigates its relationship to popularity (Cavior & Dokecki, 1973) and have not looked at similarity or dissimilarity of attractiveness

BEST COPY

in mutual and non-mutual friends, especially for the early adolescent population.

There is some evidence to suggest that the friendships of boys and girls differ. Girls were found to have more intimate friendships, list intimate conversations with friends as an important element of friendship, and express concern about faithfulness of friends more often than adolescent boys (Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Berndt, 1981; Bigelow & LaGaipa, 1980). Berndt (1982) suggested that boys and girls may differ in the type of intimate relationships they form whereas Douvan and Adelson (1966) believed that there were gender differences in socialization patterns with girls socialized to view interpersonal relationships as more important than boys. Karweit and Hansell (1983) hypothesized that males may use friendships "for status acquisition and maintenance more than do females" (p. 128). They concluded that "female networks are likely to be composed of tightly knit groupings of equal-status peers, whereas male networks will more closely resemble a clustering of cliques tied together in a loose, but discernible, status hierarchy" (p. 128). Thus, past research does support the contention that the structure of adolescent friendships may differ for males and females

Studies that have assessed differences between black and white friendship dyads are very scarce. Tuma and Hallinan

BEST COPY

(1979) found that "black children tend to form and maintain friendships more readily than nonblack children" (p. 1264). However, their classrooms were predominantly black whereas in desegregated schools many classrooms are predominantly white. There are no studies that have compared the degree of similarity, reciprocity, and proximity in male and female and black and white friendship dyads, especially during early adolescence.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of similarity and proximity on the reciprocity, gender and race of friendship dyads in early adolescence. It was hypothesized that (1) reciprocal dyads would be more similar in personality, interpersonal attitudes, physical attractiveness, and intelligence than non-reciprocal dyads; (2) female friendship dyads would be more similar than male dyads; and (3) reciprocal dyads would have more contact and be in closer proximity to their friends than non-reciprocal dyads.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 69 males and 67 females; 32% were non-white with 81% in the seventh and the remaining students in the eighth grade.

BEST COPY

Measures

Six measures were administered to obtain data on the adolescents' friendships. A sociometric questionnaire was devised to assess friendship choice. Subjects were asked to identify and rank their three best friends within their grade level. This data was then used to establish reciprocal (two students select each other as friend) and non-reciprocal dyads (a friendship selection is nonmutual). The second part of this questionnaire measured friendship proximity. For each of the three best friends listed each subject was asked a series of questions to determine whether each friend lived within walking distance, attended the same church, rode the same school bus; and were also asked how many classes and clubs they were in with each friend, and how often each week they saw each friend outside of school.

The Satisfaction and Commitment Scale (Solano & Ayers, 1984) was administered to assess the degree of friendship satisfaction and commitment experienced in regard to the student's very best friend. The scale consists of 20 statements that express an attitude toward the best friend or the friendship itself. Half of the items measure friendship commitment (e.g., My best friend and I will probably be friends for a long time) and the remainder friendship satisfaction (e.g., I am happy being friends with my best friend). Items are

BEST COPY

answered by using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree). A satisfaction and a commitment score are possible with each ranging from 0 to 100.

The students' general attitudes toward people were assessed by the Kiddie Mach which is a form of the original Machiavellianism Scale devised especially for children and measures the extent to which the subject feels that other people can be manipulated. Verbal intelligence was measured by the Word Understanding Test (WUT). The WUT measures verbal comprehension and vocabulary for junior and high school students and consists of 32 vocabulary items with a multiple choice response format. Personality was measured by the High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) which measures 14 primary personality dimensions such as stability, tension, warmth and 10 other factors (e.g., anxiety, extraversion, creativity, leadership).

Physical attractiveness was measured by using the nomination technique. Each student was asked to nominate three people from their grade level for most handsome boy and prettiest girl. In addition, they were asked to nominate classmates for the following categories: neatest, wears the nicest clothes and most likely to succeed. Scores for the physical attractiveness and nomination data were derived for each child by calculating the percentage of possible times

BEST COPY

he/she could be chosen. Lastly, students were given a questionnaire to assess background information on each of the following: sex, race, and the number of siblings.

Procedure

All data were collected in two 60-minute group sessions held within the regular classroom with testing performed by trained examiners. The HSPQ and Word Understanding Tests were given in one session and the Background Information Sheet, Kiddie Mach, Sociometric Questionnaire, Satisfaction and Commitment Scale, and Nomination Ballot were administered in a second session, all during the winter of 1984.

Results

Subjects were categorized into dyads based on three variables: reciprocity, sex and race of dyad. The reciprocal group was composed of those students who received mutual friendship choices while the non-reciprocal group consisted of those dyads with unilateral or unreciprocated friendship choices. There were 91 reciprocal and 57 non-reciprocal dyads. In addition, there were 8 cross-sex, 106 same-sex male, 99 same-sex female dyads; and 39 cross-race, 118 same-race white, and 39 same-race black dyads.

A dyad difference score was calculated for each dependent variable by subtracting the scores of the dyad members. A series of 2(dyad type: reciprocal, non-reciprocal) by 2(dyad

BEST COPY

sex: male, female) by 2(dyad race: white, black) ANOVAs were calculated using the dyad difference scores for each dependent variable. The non-reciprocal dyads were more similar than the reciprocal dyads on friendship commitment, $F(1,116) = 14.35$, $p < .001$.

Insert Table 1 about here

The male dyads were more similar than the female dyads on neatness, $F(1,143) = 11.56$, $p < .001$; nicest clothes, $F(1,143) = 14.67$, $p < .001$; friendship satisfaction, $F(1,116) = 5.86$, $p < .02$; friendship commitment, $F(1,116) = 4.44$, $p < .04$; affection, $F(1,141) = 5.32$, $p < .02$; and self sufficiency, $F(1,141) = 3.85$, $p < .05$. However, the female dyads were more similar than the male dyads on the following variables: intelligence, $F(1,143) = 5.57$, $p < .02$; independence, $F(1,141) = 4.42$, $p < .04$; neuroticism, $F(1,141) = 9.24$, $p < .003$; delinquency, $F(1,141) = 6.22$, $p < .01$; assertiveness, $F(1,141) = 4.43$, $p < .04$; seriousness, $F(1,141) = 4.46$, $p < .04$; and guilt proneness, $F(1,141) = 4.58$, $p < .03$. There was a significant reciprocity by sex of dyad interaction on the neatness variable, $F(1,143) = 6.62$, $p < .01$. The non-reciprocal male dyads were most similar while the non-reciprocal female dyads were the least similar on their neatness nominations.

BEST COPY

The black and white dyads differed on 9 variables. White dyads were more similar than black dyads in intelligence, $F(1,143) = 18.61$, $p < .001$; assertiveness, $F(1,141) = 8.78$, $p < .004$; and mental alertness, $F(1,141) = 11.17$, $p < .001$; and less similar in physical attractiveness, $F(1,143) = 6.23$, $p < .01$; anxiety, $F(1,141) = 6.82$, $p < .01$; school achievement, $F(1,141) = 11.22$, $p < .001$; and HSPQ intelligence, $F(1,141) = 5.82$, $p < .02$; and zestfulness, $F(1,141) = 6.26$, $p < .01$.

There was a dyad sex by dyad reciprocity interaction on the zestfulness, $F(1,141) = 5.43$, $p < .02$, and the tension personality variable, $F(1,141) = 4.71$, $p < .03$. Male reciprocal dyads and female non-reciprocal dyads were more similar in zestfulness than female non-reciprocal and male reciprocal dyads. In addition, non-reciprocal female dyads were the most similar and reciprocal female dyads least similar on the tension variable.

There were 4 significant dyad race by dyad sex interactions on the following variables: nicest clothes, $F(1,143)$ 4.69, $p < .03$; intelligence, $F(1,143) = 10.91$, $p < .001$; mental alertness, $F(1,141) = 4.68$, $p < .03$; and friendship satisfaction, $F(1,116) = 10.71$, $p < .001$. White male dyads were most dissimilar and white female dyads most similar on the nominations they received for nicest clothes. The white female dyads were most similar and black male dyads were least similar

BEST COPY

on their intelligence scores. The white female dyads were most similar and the black female dyads least similar on mental alertness. Finally, the white male and black female dyads expressed more similar friendship satisfaction than the white female and black male dyads.

Separate step-wise discriminant analyses were calculated with either dyad reciprocity, dyad sex, or dyad race as the criterion variable and the dependent measures as the discriminators. The following 9 variables (listed in order of importance) correctly classified 67% of the dyads (reciprocal, 69%; non-reciprocal, 65%) and were significant discriminators, $\chi^2(9) = 32.94$, $p < .001$, and a Wilks' Lambda of .815: friendship commitment, number of shared clubs, mental alertness, nicest clothes, school achievement, assertiveness emotional stability, friendship satisfaction, and seriousness.

Insert Table 2 about here

The female dyads were significantly discriminated from the male dyads, $\chi^2(20) = 94.95$, $p < .001$, Wilks' Lambda of .529. The following 20 variables classified 77% of the total sample, 82% of the male dyads, and 71% of the female dyads: nicest clothes, number of siblings, neuroticism, neatness, attractiveness, intelligence most likely to succeed,

BEST COPY

seriousness, guilt proneness, self-sufficiency, assertiveness, number of shared clubs, anxiety, emotional stability, zestfulness, leadership potential, friendship satisfaction, school achievement, shyness, and tension.

The white dyads were significantly discriminated from the black dyads, $\underline{X}^2(13) = 76.48$, $\underline{p} < .001$, Wilks' Lambda of .53. The following 13 variables correctly classified 88% of the dyads (white dyads, 90%; black dyads, 87%): intelligence, school achievement, number of siblings, attractiveness, independence, anxiety, friendship commitment, mental alertness, sensitivity, conscientiousness, vigor, friendship satisfaction, and the HSPQ intelligence.

A series of oneway ANOVAs were computed on the dependent variables with dyad race (cross-race, same-race white, same-race black) as the independent variable. Data from the same-race white dyads was weighted to make the total number of dyads similar to the other 2 dyad race groups. The cross-race dyads differ from the same-race dyads on 5 variables: anxiety, $\underline{F}(2,112) = 3.94$, $\underline{p} < .02$; mental alertness, $\underline{F}(2,112) = 5.46$, $\underline{p} < .005$; school achievement, $\underline{F}(2,112) = 6.54$, $\underline{p} < .002$; assertiveness, $\underline{F}(2,112) = 4.63$, $\underline{p} < .01$; and friendship commitment, $\underline{F}(2,97) = 3.80$, $\underline{p} < .03$. Based on Scheffe Post-hoc analyses the cross-race dyads were more similar than the same-race dyads on mental alertness and more similar than

BEST COPY

same-race black dyads on assertiveness. Black dyads were more similar than cross-race dyads on anxiety and school achievement. In addition, cross-race dyads were more similar than white dyads on friendship commitment.

Insert Table 3 about here

Chi-square analyses to assess the relationship between reciprocity, dyad sex, dyad race, and proximity were calculated. There were more same-sex than cross-sex friendships in the reciprocal group, $\chi^2(2) = 7.64$, $p < .02$, however, the majority of friendships were same-sex. A larger proportion of the male than female dyads were non-reciprocal. There was a trend toward a greater number of cross-race friendships occurring in the non-reciprocal group, $\chi^2(2) = 5.06$, $p < .08$. Those dyads who took only 2 or less classes together were most often non-reciprocal, $\chi^2(1) = 10.13$, $p < .002$. In addition, 60% of the reciprocal dyads and 40% of the non-reciprocal dyads attended the same church, $\chi^2(1) = 4.33$, $p < .04$.

The same-race black dyads more often lived in walking distance of their friends $\chi^2(2) = 48.36$, $p < .001$, and spent more time with their friends, $\chi^2(2) = 19.67$, $p < .001$), than either cross-race or same-race white dyads. The same-race white dyads took more classes with their friends, $\chi^2(2) = 9.99$,

BEST COPY

$p < .007$; and attended the same church as their best friends more often than either the cross-race or same-race black dyads, $\chi^2(2) = 13.23$, $p < .001$. The same-race dyads (both black and white) rode the same school bus with best friends more often than the cross-race dyads, $\chi^2(2) = 7.59$, $p < .02$.

Discussion

Female friends were more similar than male friends and black friends were more similar than white friends, regardless of reciprocity. Mutual friends were no more similar in personality and attitudes than non-mutual friends, contradicting the first hypothesis and previous research with younger populations (Clark & Drewry, in press). This discrepant finding may be a function of several factors. Cohen (1977) studied the homogeneity of adolescent peer groups concluding that both conformity pressures and homophilic selection interacted to bring about homogeneous peer groups during adolescence. Early adolescents experience a great deal of pressure to conform which may result in their being more similar in attitudes, beliefs and interests than any other age group. Even adolescents in non-mutual relationships may be selecting peers who are similar to themselves on several dimensions as shown by correlational data from Karweit and Hansell (1983). However, it is also possible that a certain degree of complementarity characterizes

BEST COPY

early adolescent mutual friendships as suggested by Berndt (1982).

A greater number of male than female dyads were categorized as non-reciprocal, which is consistent with past research (Epstein, 1983; Hansell, 1981). Karweit and Hansell (1983) proposed that there were sex differences in the internal structure of peer groups. The intimacy needs of females could be best met by dyadic relationships whereas the male need for competitive and leadership activity required larger "loosely coupled groups". Thus, male dyads would have a tendency to be more non-reciprocal than female dyads. Both males and females selected same-sex peers as friends which is consistent with previous studies (Crockett, Losoff, & Petersen, 1984; Hartup, 1983; Schofield, 1981) and when cross-sex friendships did occur they were most often non-reciprocal in nature. Crockett, Losoff and Petersen (1984) found a greater intimacy in same-sex friends during early adolescence and thus concluded that close cross-sex friendships are not yet developed at this age level.

Male and female dyads differed considerably on their degree of similarity in personality, intelligence, satisfaction and commitment to friendships, and the nature of their classroom nominations received. Female friendships are thought to be oriented toward issues of loyalty, intimacy, and commitment (Berndt, 1982; Karweit & Hansell, 1983). However, regardless of

BEST COPY

the level of commitment, male friends were more similar than female friends in their evaluations of the degree of satisfaction with and level of commitment to their present friendships. Karweit and Hansell (1983) proposed that the transition from elementary to junior high school is stressful for adolescent females because the introduction of multiple classes and teachers interfers with the development and maintenance of intimate dyadic friendships. However, males continued their activity-based friendships, a pattern began in elementary school. Tuma and Hallinan (1979) found that males had significantly more stable best friend choices than females. Taken together these findings suggest that the level of satisfaction for male friends should be more similar than for female friends.

Male friends were more similar than female friends on the status variables such as nominations for neatest and nicest clothes which is consistent with the past notion that status characteristics are more important in male than female friendship selection (Karweit & Hansell, 1983). Female friends appeared to be much more similar than male friends in personality and intelligence, supporting the conclusion that "the higher similarity within female dyads may reflect the fact that reciprocated choosers tend to be more similar than nonreciprocated choosers, and girls have more reciprocated

BEST COPY

choices than do boys" (Karweit & Hansell, 1983, p. 123). In addition, personality similarity of friends may be necessary for intimate self-disclosure to occur, a behavior found more frequently in female than male friendships (see Crockett, Losoff & Petersen, 1984; Rivenbark, 1971).

Black and white friends differed mainly on the degree to which their personalities and intelligence levels were similar. Black friends were slightly more similar in personality than white friends. However, on some personality variables (e.g., assertiveness, mental alertness) the white dyads were more similar than the black dyads.

Little is known about the structure of black friendships and past findings are contradictory. Hallinan (1982) reported that black students were more likely than white students to segregate themselves in school and select same-race peers as close friends. She concluded that either black students "may attach greater importance to establishing friendships with their own race in order to maintain their racial and cultural identity" (p. 66) or that "blacks may feel a need to protect themselves from real or imagined social threats by turning to peers of their own race for social support" (pp. 65-66). However, other researchers have shown that black children tend to make more cross-race friendship choices than white students (Asher, Oden & Gottman, 1977; Shaw, 1973) and these cross-race

BEST COPY

choices are most often non-reciprocal (Clark & Drewry, in press). A closer look at the Hallinan data shows that in majority black classrooms white children made more cross-race choices for best friend (70%) than same-race friendship choices (30%). In majority white classrooms black children showed the same pattern of best friend selection (i.e., 70% cross-race; 30% same-race). These findings raise some doubts about the validity of the notion that black children segregate themselves in desegregated school settings.

Black adolescents must adjust to the stresses of adolescence along with racial prejudice and isolation associated with minority status in desegregated schools. Their black friends may help them to cope with negative racial interactions. Just as female friendships are characterized by more intimacy than male friendships, black friends may share a different level of intimacy than white friends. Tuma and Hallinan (1978) found that black children formed friends more rapidly and had more stable friendships than white children. In addition, Hallinan (1982) found that black students made twice as many best friend choices as whites. These findings suggest that black friendships may be more important to the social support system of black than white students. Past researchers have noted that minority children in desegregated classrooms who lack an adequate support group of same-race peers may feel

BEST COPY

threatened and experience adjustment problems (Miller, 1983); Rogers & Miller, 1980). In addition black students may not get the same degree of positive support from teachers that white students receive, especially if the teachers are prejudiced.

Cross-race friendships occurred less frequently than same-race friendships and more frequently than cross-sex friendships, supporting past findings (Clark & Drewry, in press; Gerald & Miller, 1975; Schofield, 1981; Singleton & Asher, 1979). Schofield (1981) proposed that the social identities attached to blacks and whites were not complementary and hindered the development of friendships between black and white children. Early adolescents may see themselves as dissimilar to those of other racial groups, which would then lead to more same-race friendship choices. In the present study, cross-race dyads were more similar than black and white friends in mental alertness, more similar than black dyads on assertiveness, and more similar than white dyads on friendship commitment. However, cross-race friendships appeared to be closer in structure to white than black friendships. In addition, slightly more cross-race friendships were non-reciprocal which is consistent with previous research (Clark & Drewry, in press). Findings from the present study suggest that interracial friendships may have some unique qualities that need to be investigated in future research.

BEST COPY

Proximity was of some importance in early adolescent friendships. The reciprocal dyads came into more contact with each other than the non-reciprocal dyads by virtue of their similar classroom assignments and common church activity. Crockett, Losoff, and Petersen (1984) found that friends saw each other on a daily basis with their primary contact occurring in school. The black dyads seemed to be in closer proximity to each other because they were more likely to live in walking distance of their selected best friends and they spent more time outside of school with their friends than white or cross-race dyads. The white dyads saw each other more often than black dyads in class or at church. In addition, black and white dyads were more likely to ride to school together than cross-race dyads. Thus, cross-race friends appeared to have less contact with each other than same-race friends and white friends had more in-school contact than black friends. These findings support the general belief of previous researchers that the social structure of schools influences the nature of friendship formation (see Epstein, 1983; Hallinan, 1979).

Similarity and proximity appear to be more important than reciprocity in understanding the nature of early adolescent friendships. Present and past data support the notion that male and female friendships are structurally different. In addition, black friendships may have some unique qualities. Additional research is needed to assess the effects of race and gender on friendships during early adolescence.

BEST COPY

References

Asher, S., Oden, S., & Gottman, J. (1977). Children's friendships in school settings. In L. Katz (Ed.), Current topics in early childhood education (Vol. 1). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ball, S. (1981). Beachside comprehensive. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berndt, T. (1981). The effects of friendship on prosocial intentions and behavior. Child Development, 52, 636-643.

Berndt, T. (1982). The features and effects of friendship in early adolescence. Child Development, 53, 1447-1460.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1983). Interpersonal attraction. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Bigelow, B., & LaGaipa, J. (1980). The development of friendship values and choice. In H. Foot, A. Chapman, & J. Smith (Eds.), Friendship and social relations in children (pp. 15-44). New York: Wiley.

Cavior, N., & Dokecki, P. (1973). Physical attractiveness, perceived attitude similarity, and academic achievement as contributors to interpersonal attraction among adolescents. Developmental Psychology 9, 44-54.

Clark, M. L., & Drewry, D. (in press). Similarity and reciprocity in the friendships of elementary school children. Child Study Journal.

BEST COPY

Cohen, J. (1977). Sources of peer group homogeneity. Sociology of Education, 50, 227-241.

Crockett, L., Losoff, M., & Petersen, A. (1984). Perceptions of the peer group and friendship in early adolescence. Journal of Early Adolescence, 4, 155-181.

Douvan, E., & Adelson, J. (1966). The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley.

Duck, S., & Craig, G. (1978). Personality similarity and the development of friendship: A longitudinal study. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17, 237-242.

Duck, S., & Spencer, C. (1972). Personal constructs and friendship formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 40-45.

Epstein, J. (1983). Selection of friends in differently organized schools and classrooms. In J. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools (pp. 73-92). New York: Academic Press.

Gerald, H., & Miller, N. (1975). School desegregation. New York: Plenum.

Hallinan, M. (1979). Structural effects on children's friendships and cliques. Social Psychological Quarterly, 42, 43-54.

Hallinan, M. (1982). Classroom racial composition and children's friendships. Social Forces, 61, 56-72.

BEST COPY

Henderson, M., & Furnham, A. (1982). Similarity and attraction: The relationship between personality, beliefs, skills, needs and friendship choice. Journal of Adolescence, 5, 111-123.

Izard, C. (1960). Personality, similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61. 47-51.

Kandel, D. (1978). Similarity in real-life adolescent friendship pairs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 306-312.

Karweit, N., & Hansell, S. (1983). Sex differences in adolescent relationships: Friendship and status. In J. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in school: Patterns of Selection and influence in secondary schools (pp. 115-130). New York: Academic Press.

Miller, N. (1983). Peer relations in desegregated schools. In J. Epstein & N. Karweit (Eds.), Friends in school: Patterns Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools (pp. 201-217). New York: Academic Press.

Rivenbark, W. (1971). Self disclosure patterns among adolescents. Psychological Reports, 28, 35-42.

Rogers, M., & Miller, N. (1980). The effect of school setting on cross-racial interaction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal.

BEST COPY

Schofield, J. (1981). Complementary and conflicting identities: Images and interaction in an interracial school. In S. Asher & J. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 53-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singleton, L., & Asher, S. (1979). Racial integration and children's peer preferences: An investigation of developmental and cohort differences. Child Development, 50. 936-941.

Solano, C., & Ayers, M. (1984, March). Predicting satisfaction and commitment in adolescent friendships. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans.

Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.

Tuma, N., & Hallinan, M. (1979). The effects of sex, race and achievement on school children's friendships. Social Forces, 57, 1265-1285.

BEST COPY

Table 1

Dyad Difference Score Means by Reciprocity, Sex, and Race

	Dyad Reciprocity		Dyad Sex		Dyad Race	
	Reciprocal	Non-Reciprocal	Male	Female	White	Black
Neatness	5.12	6.83	4.06	8.14***	6.22	5.37
Nicest Clothes	5.84	5.32	3.39	7.96***	5.90	4.58
Attractiveness	13.55	13.44	14.52	12.36	15.32	8.05**
Intelligence	1.11	1.36	1.53	.92*	.96	2.08***
Anxiety	18.06	16.14	16.82	17.34	18.71	12.11**
Alertness	22.03	23.36	23.54	21.79	20.06	30.76***
Independence	22.28	22.14	25.09	18.96*	21.25	25.41
School Achievement	20.54	17.75	17.23	21.21	21.56	11.65***
Neuroticism	17.25	17.49	20.73	13.59**	16.48	20.08
Delinquency	17.49	18.47	20.75	14.89**	17.67	18.97
Affection	1.75	1.79	2.01	1.50*	1.85	1.54
HSPQ Intelligence	1.57	1.78	1.77	1.57	1.82	1.24*
Assertiveness	2.39	2.10	2.53	1.91*	2.01	95**
Seriousness	2.31	2.11	2.51	1.82*	2.11	2.4.
Zestfulness	2.11	2.01	2.10	2.01	2.25	1.49*
Guilt Proneness	1.94	1.82	2.09	1.64*	1.90	1.81
Self Sufficiency	2.07	1.78	1.65	2.23**	1.89	2.00
Friendship Satisfaction	40.78	38.32	38.32	40.91*	39.54	39.26
Friendship Commitment	42.02	38.03**	38.75	41.33*	40.53	38.00
N of Dyads	72	77	79	70	112	37

Note. The smaller the mean score the greater the similarity of dyad members.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

BEST COPY

Table 2

Discriminators of Dyad Reciprocity, Dyad Sex, and Dyad Race

	Dyad Reciprocity	Dyad Sex	Dyad Race
Likely to Succeed		x	
Neatness		x	
Nicest Clothes	x	x	
Attractive		x	x
Shared Clubs	x	x	
Intelligence		x	x
#Siblings		x	x
Anxiety		x	x
Mental Alertness	x		x
Independence			x
School Achievement	x	x	x
Neuroticism		x	
Leadership Potential		x	
HSPQ Intelligence			x
Emotional stability	x	x	
Assertiveness	x	x	
Seriousness	x	x	
Conscientiousness			x
Shyness		x	
Sensitivity			x
Zestfulness		x	x
Guilt Proneness		x	
Self-Sufficiency		x	
Tension		x	
Satisfaction	x	x	x
Commitment	x		x
Classification results	67%	77%	88%

BEST COPY

Table 3

Dyad Difference Scores by Race

	Dyad Race		
	Cross-Race	White	Black
Neatness	10.62	6.22	5.37*
Attractiveness	15.51	15.32	8.05*
Intelligence	1.72	.98	2.05**
Anxiety	19.64	18.99	12.11*
Mental Alertness	19.05	20.06	30.76**
School Achievement	21.18	21.71	11.65**
HSPQ Intelligence	1.97	1.82	1.24*
Assertiveness	1.90	2.00	2.96*
Friendship Commitment	37.54	37.78	40.85*
N of Dyads	37	37	37[a]

Note. The smaller the score the greater similarity of dyad members.

[a]These numbers varied slightly in some analyses because of missing data.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

BEST COPY